



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1460
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1460
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/266,680	03/11/1999	JEFF YOUNG	07844/292001	6131
7590 11/29/2006 FISH & RICHARDSON 500 ARQUELLO STREE SUITE 500 REDWOOD CITY, CA 94063			EXAMINER BASHORE, WILLIAM L	
			ART UNIT 2176	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/266,680

Applicant(s)

YOUNG ET AL.

Examiner

William L. Bashore

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 September 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 14, 16-18, 20, 22-25, 28-30, 32 and 34-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14, 16-18, 20, 22-25, 28-30, 32 and 34-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communication: amendment filed 9/20/2006, to the original application filed 3/11/1999. IDS filed 12/3/2001, and 4/11/2002.
2. Claims 14, 16-18, 20, 22-25, 28-30, 32, 34-36 pending. Claims 14, 22, 25, 28, 34 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. **The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:**

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 14, 16-18, 20, 22-25, 28-30, 32, 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Motoyama et al. (hereinafter Motoyama), U.S. Patent No. 6,009,436 issued December 28, 1999, in view of Gajraj (hereinafter Gajraj), U.S. Publication No. 2002/0002566 filed July 16, 1998, published January 3, 2002.**

In regard to independent claim 14, Motoyama teaches:

- converting a format of a first source document (SGML) into a format of another similarly structured document (HTML). Motoyama teaches mapping from SGML to HTML utilizing mapping tables of Appendices A-D, said mapping utilizing various heuristics in order to perform said mapping (Motoyama Appendix A-D, Abstract, column 3 lines 27-29, column 6 lines 30-32; compare with claim 14 "*A computer executable method of converting....the method comprising:*").

- Motoyama does not specifically teach identifying patterns common within documents (by identifying common elements between document DTDs). However, Gajraj teaches transformation of SGML documents utilizing analysis of a source document DTD, and a target DTD (Gajraj Abstract, paragraph [0014]). Patterns are ascertained by finding elements in both DTD documents corresponding to a common base class (Gajraj paragraphs [0015], [0016], [0017], [0024], see also Figure 16 item 380 which discloses mapping between DTDs). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Gajraj's pattern identification to Motoyama, providing Motoyama the benefit of simplifying the exchange of similar documents for reuse, by taking into account common patterns in the mapping process (see Gajraj Abstract – at bottom).

- Motoyama does not specifically teach mapping “*without user intervention*”. However, Gajraj teaches certain conditions whereby the mapping process is automated without user intervention (Gajraj paragraphs [0109], [0111], [0112]). See also Gajraj paragraph [0128] describing automation without user intervention. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Gajraj to Motoyama, providing Motoyama the benefit of a speedier document analysis.

- Motoyama teaches mapping elements in a first document, to another element in a second document (Motoyama column 6 lines 29-38, Figures 1A – 1D). It is noted that Motoyama teaches an SGML document with its corresponding DTD (Figure 1C and 1A, respectively). A mapping is created (Figure 1B), resulting in conversion to an equivalent HTML document (Figure 1D). Motoyama's conversion entails an SGML document start tag specifically mapped to its (differently named) HTML equivalent (both tags are of type “start tag”, but are named differently (Motoyama column 8 lines 14-18, 40-42, SGML tag named <t> maps to HTML tag named <html>, etc.) (see also Motoyama column 7 lines 5-11; compare with claim 14 “...wherein identifying patterns includes identifying an element that is common to the first and second source documents but has a different name in the first source document than in the second source document”).

- mapping elements and sub-elements from one source document to equivalent elements and sub-elements in the second document, the mapping of SGML elements to HTML elements are used by Motoyama to

Art Unit: 2176

produce documents accordingly (Motoyama column 6 lines 1-10, Appendix B, D, Figures 1A – 1D, 3A- 3B; compare with claim 14 “*map elements and sub-elements....in the second source document,*”).

Motoyama teaches mapping elements in a first document, to another element in a second document (Motoyama column 6 lines 29-38, Figures 1A – 1D). It is noted that Motoyama teaches an SGML document with its corresponding DTD (Figure 1C and 1A, respectively). A mapping is created (Figure 1B), resulting in conversion to an equivalent HTML document (Figure 1D). Motoyama’s conversion entails an SGML document start tag specifically mapped to its (differently named) HTML equivalent (Motoyama column 8 lines 14-18, 40-42, SGML tag <t> maps to HTML tag <html>, etc.) (see also Motoyama column 7 lines 5-11; compare with claim 14 “...including mapping a first element in the first source document to a second element in the second source document”, and “the first element and the second element having different element names.”).

Motoyama teaches transformation of an SGML document into an HTML document, said transformation incorporating analyzation of their respective DTDs, and utilizing the mappings of Appendices A-D (i.e. comparison of an SGML DTD and an HTML DTD) (Motoyama Abstract, column 6 lines 1-4, 30-32, Appendices A-D, Figures 3A-3B; compare with claim 14).

In regard to dependent claim 15, Motoyama teaches mappings within Appendices A-D, said appendices comprising various tag replacement (Motoyama column 29 line 45, to column 31 line 48; compare with claim 15).

In regard to dependent claim 16, Motoyama teaches transformation of an SGML document into an HTML document, said transformation incorporating analyzation of their respective DTDs, and utilizing the mappings of Appendices A-D (Motoyama Abstract, column 6 lines 1-4, 30-32, Appendices A-D, Figures 3A-3B; compare with claim 16).

In regard to dependent claim 17, Motoyama does not specifically teach creating a DTD if one does not exist in the first document. However, Takasawa teaches a DTD created from analyzation of structured information from a sample document (Takasawa page 4 at middle; compare with claim 17). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Takasawa's DTD creation to Motoyama, providing Motoyama the flexibility of creating an initial DTD if needed.

In regard to dependent claim 18, claim 18 is rejected using the same rejection and rationale as set forth by the Examiner in the current rejection of claim 14.

In regard to dependent claim 20, Motoyama teaches mnpping from SGML to HTML utilizing mapping tables of Appendices A-D (Motoyama Appendix A-D). Motoyama does not specifically recite "heuristics". However, Gajraj teaches saving a set of mapping rules (heuristics) (Gajraj paragraph [0127], [0128]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Gajraj to Motoyama, providing Motoyama the benefit of heuristics for more accurate results from a diverse set of document.

In regard to dependent claim 21, claim 21 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 14, and in further view of the following, is rejected along the same rationale.

Motoyama teaches that processing systems are known in which a processor converts a markup language document automatically into another format (Motoyama column 2 lines 42-45; compare with claim 21), therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to automate Motoyama's invention to benefit from the advantages that automation provides (i.e. freeing up human resources).

In regard to independent claim 22, Motoyama teaches:

- converting a format of a first source document (SGML) into a format of another similarly structured document (HTML). Motoyama teaches mapping from SGML to HTML utilizing mapping tables of Appendices A-D, said mapping utilizing various heuristics in order to perform said mapping (Motoyama Appendix A-D, Abstract, column 3 lines 27-29, column 6 lines 30-32; compare with claim 22 “*A method of converting....the method comprising:*”).

- Motoyama does not specifically teach identifying patterns common within documents (by identifying common elements between document DTDs). However, Gajraj teaches transformation of SGML documents utilizing analysis of a source document DTD, and a target DTD (Gajraj Abstract, paragraph [0014]). Patterns are ascertained by finding elements in both DTD documents corresponding to a common base class (Gajraj paragraphs [0015], [0016], [0017], [0024], see also Figure 16 item 380 which discloses mapping between DTDs). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Gajraj’s pattern identification to Motoyama, providing Motoyama the benefit of simplifying the exchange of similar documents for reuse, by taking into account common patterns in the mapping process (see Gajraj Abstract – at bottom).

- Motoyama does not specifically teach mapping “*without user intervention*”. However, Gajraj teaches certain conditions whereby the mapping process is automated without user intervention (Gajraj paragraphs [0109], [0111], [0112]). See also Gajraj paragraph [0128] describing complete automation without user intervention. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Gajraj to Motoyama, providing Motoyama the benefit of a speedier document analysis.

- Motoyama teaches mapping elements in a first document, to another element in a second document (Motoyama column 6 lines 29-38, Figures 1A – 1D). It is noted that Motoyama teaches an SGML document with its corresponding DTD (Figure 1C and 1A, respectively). A mapping is created (Figure 1B), resulting in conversion to an equivalent HTML document (Figure 1D). Motoyama’s conversion entails an SGML document start tag specifically mapped to its (differently named) HTML equivalent (both tags are of type “start tag”, but

Art Unit: 2176

are named differently (Motoyama column 8 lines 14-18, 40-42, SGML tag named <t> maps to HTML tag named <html>, etc.) (see also Motoyama column 7 lines 5-11; compare with claim 22 “...wherein identifying patterns includes identifying an element that is common to the first and second source documents but has a different name in the first source document than in the second source document”).

- mapping elements and sub-elements from one source document to equivalent elements and sub-elements in the second document, the mapping of SGML elements to HTML elements are used by Motoyama to produce documents accordingly (Motoyama column 6 lines 1-10, Appendix B, D, Figures 3A- 3B; compare with claim 22 “mapping elements and sub-elements....in the set of source documents.”, and “in the common pattern of the source document”, and “in common pattern of the set of source documents”).

- Motoyama teaches mappings within Appendices A-D, said appendices comprising various tag replacement (Motoyama column 29 line 45, to column 31 line 48; compare with claim 22 “replacing tag names”).

- Motoyama teaches mapping elements in a first document, to another element in a second document (Motoyama column 6 lines 29-38, Figures 1A – 1D). It is noted that Motoyama teaches an SGML document with its corresponding DTD (Figure 1C and 1A, respectively). A mapping is created (Figure 1B), resulting in conversion to an equivalent HTML document (Figure 1D). Motoyama’s conversion entails an SGML document start tag specifically mapped to its (differently named) HTML equivalent (Motoyama column 8 lines 14-18, 40-42, SGML tag <t> maps to HTML tag <html>, etc.) (see also Motoyama column 7 lines 5-11; compare with claim 22 “...including mapping a first element in the first source document to a second element in the second source document”, and “the first element and the second element having different element names.”).

Motoyama teaches transformation of an SGML document into an HTML document, said transformation incorporating analyzation of their respective DTDs, and utilizing the mappings of Appendices A-D (i.e. comparison of an SGML DTD and an HTML DTD) (Motoyama Abstract, column 6 lines 1-4, 30-32, Appendices A-D, Figures 3A-3B; compare with claim 22).

In regard to dependent claim 23, Motoyama teaches transformation of an SGML document into an HTML document, said transformation incorporating analyzation of their respective DTDs, and utilizing the mappings of Appendices A-D (Motoyama Abstract, column 6 lines 1-4, 30-32, Appendices A-D, Figures 3A-3B; compare with claim 23).

In regard to dependent claim 24, Motoyama does not specifically teach creating a DTD if one does not exist in the first document. However, Takasawa teaches a DTD created from analyzation of structured information from a sample document (Takasawa page 4 at middle; compare with claim 24). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Takasawa's DTD creation to Motoyama, providing Motoyama the flexibility of creating an initial DTD if needed.

In regard to independent claim 25, Motoyama teaches:

- converting a format of a first source document (SGML) into a format of another similarly structured document (HTML). Motoyama teaches mapping from SGML to HTML utilizing mapping tables of Appendices A-D, said mapping utilizing various heuristics in order to perform said mapping (Motoyama Appendix A-D, Abstract, column 3 lines 27-29, column 6 lines 30-32; compare with claim 25 "*A computer program....causing a computer system to:*").

- Motoyama does not specifically teach identifying patterns common within documents (by identifying common elements between document DTDs). However, Gajraj teaches transformation of SGML documents utilizing analysis of a source document DTD, and a target DTD (Gajraj Abstract, paragraph [0014]). Patterns are ascertained by finding elements in both DTD documents corresponding to a common base class (Gajraj paragraphs [0015], [0016], [0017], [0024], see also Figure 16 item 380 which discloses mapping between DTDs). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Gajraj's pattern identification to Motoyama, providing Motoyama the benefit of simplifying the exchange of

Art Unit: 2176

similar documents for reuse, by taking into account common patterns in the mapping process (see Gajraj Abstract – at bottom).

- Motoyama does not specifically teach mapping “*without user intervention*”. However, Gajraj teaches certain conditions whereby the mapping process is automated without user intervention (Gajraj paragraphs [0109], [0111], [0112]). See also Gajraj paragraph [0128] describing complete automation without user intervention. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Gajraj to Motoyama, providing Motoyama the benefit of a speedier document analysis.

- Motoyama teaches mapping elements in a first document, to another element in a second document (Motoyama column 6 lines 29-38, Figures 1A – 1D). It is noted that Motoyama teaches an SGML document with its corresponding DTD (Figure 1C and 1A, respectively). A mapping is created (Figure 1B), resulting in conversion to an equivalent HTML document (Figure 1D). Motoyama’s conversion entails an SGML document start tag specifically mapped to its (differently named) HTML equivalent (both tags are of type “start tag”, but are named differently (Motoyama column 8 lines 14-18, 40-42, SGML tag named <t> maps to HTML tag named <html>, etc.) (see also Motoyama column 7 lines 5-11; compare with claim 25 “...*wherein to identify patterns includes to identify an element that is common to the first and second source documents but has a different name in the first source document than in the second source document*”).

- mapping elements and sub-elements from one source document to equivalent elements and sub-elements in the second document, the mapping of SGML elements to HTML elements are used by Motoyama to produce documents accordingly (Motoyama column 6 lines 1-10, Appendix B, D, Figures 3A- 3B; compare with claim 25 “*map elements and sub-elements....of the second source document.*”).

- Motoyama teaches mapping elements in a first document, to another element in a second document (Motoyama column 6 lines 29-38, Figures 1A – 1D). It is noted that Motoyama teaches an SGML document with its corresponding DTD (Figure 1C and 1A, respectively). A mapping is created (Figure 1B), resulting in conversion to an equivalent HTML document (Figure 1D). Motoyama’s conversion entails an SGML document start tag specifically mapped to its (differently named) HTML equivalent (Motoyama column 8 lines 14-18, 40-

Art Unit: 2176

42, SGML tag <t> maps to HTML tag <html>, etc.) (see also Motoyama column 7 lines 5-11; compare with claim 25 “...to map a first element in the first source document to a second element in the second source document”, and “the first element and the second element having different element names.”).

Motoyama teaches transformation of an SGML document into an HTML document, said transformation incorporating analyzation of their respective DTDs, and utilizing the mappings of Appendices A-D (i.e. comparison of an SGML DTD and an HTML DTD) (Motoyama Abstract, column 6 lines 1-4, 30-32, Appendices A-D, Figures 3A-3B; compare with claim 25).

In regard to dependent claim 26, Motoyama teaches mappings within Appendices A-D, said appendices comprising various tag replacement (Motoyama column 29 line 45, to column 31 line 48; compare with claim 26).

In regard to dependent claim 27, Motoyama teaches transformation of an SGML document into an HTML document, said transformation incorporating analyzation of their respective DTDs, and utilizing the mappings of Appendices A-D (Motoyama Abstract, column 6 lines 1-4, 30-32, Appendices A-D, Figures 3A-3B; compare with claim 27).

In regard to independent claim 28, Motoyama teaches:

- a storage device (Motoyama Figure 19 item 1236; compare with claim 28 “a storage device”).
- converting a format of a first source document (SGML) into a format of another similarly structured document (HTML). Motoyama teaches mapping from SGML to HTML utilizing mapping tables of Appendices A-D, said mapping utilizing various heuristics in order to perform said mapping (Motoyama Appendix A-D, Abstract, column 3 lines 27-29, column 6 lines 30-32; compare with claim 28 “A computer system comprising”, and “for storing a source document....the set of source documents;”).

- Motoyama does not specifically teach identifying patterns common within documents (by identifying common elements between document DTDs). However, Gajraj teaches transformation of SGML documents utilizing analysis of a source document DTD, and a target DTD (Gajraj Abstract, paragraph [0014]). Patterns are ascertained by finding elements in both DTD documents corresponding to a common base class (Gajraj paragraphs [0015], [0016], [0017], [0024], see also Figure 16 item 380 which discloses mapping between DTDs). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Gajraj's pattern identification to Motoyama, providing Motoyama the benefit of simplifying the exchange of similar documents for reuse, by taking into account common patterns in the mapping process (see Gajraj Abstract – at bottom).

- Motoyama does not specifically teach mapping “*without user intervention*”. However, Gajraj teaches certain conditions whereby the mapping process is automated without user intervention (Gajraj paragraphs [0109], [0111], [0112]). See also Gajraj paragraph [0128] describing complete automation without user intervention. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Gajraj to Motoyama, providing Motoyama the benefit of a speedier document analysis.

- Motoyama teaches mapping elements in a first document, to another element in a second document (Motoyama column 6 lines 29-38, Figures 1A – 1D). It is noted that Motoyama teaches an SGML document with its corresponding DTD (Figure 1C and 1A, respectively). A mapping is created (Figure 1B), resulting in conversion to an equivalent HTML document (Figure 1D). Motoyama's conversion entails an SGML document start tag specifically mapped to its (differently named) HTML equivalent (both tags are of type “start tag”, but are named differently (Motoyama column 8 lines 14-18, 40-42, SGML tag named <t> maps to HTML tag named <html>, etc.) (see also Motoyama column 7 lines 5-11; compare with claim 28 “...*wherein to identify patterns includes to identify an element that is common to the first and second source documents but has a different name in the first source document than in the second source document*”).

- mapping elements and sub-elements from one source document to equivalent elements and sub-elements in the second document, the mapping of SGML elements to HTML elements are used by Motoyama to

Art Unit: 2176

produce documents accordingly (Motoyama column 6 lines 1-10, Appendix B, D, Figures 3A- 3B; compare with claim 28 “*map elements and sub-elements....of the set of source documents.*”).

- Motoyama teaches mapping elements in a first document, to another element in a second document (Motoyama column 6 lines 29-38, Figures 1A – 1D). It is noted that Motoyama teaches an SGML document with its corresponding DTD (Figure 1C and 1A, respectively). A mapping is created (Figure 1B), resulting in conversion to an equivalent HTML document (Figure 1D). Motoyama’s conversion entails an SGML document start tag specifically mapped to its (differently named) HTML equivalent (Motoyama column 8 lines 14-18, 40-42, SGML tag <t> maps to HTML tag <html>, etc.) (see also Motoyama column 7 lines 5-11; compare with claim 28 “...including mapping a first element in the first source document to a second element in the second source document”, and “the first element and the second element having different element names.”).

Motoyama teaches transformation of an SGML document into an HTML document, said transformation incorporating analyzation of their respective DTDs, and utilizing the mappings of Appendices A-D (i.e. comparison of an SGML DTD and an HTML DTD) (Motoyama Abstract, column 6 lines 1-4, 30-32, Appendices A-D, Figures 3A-3B; compare with claim 28).

In regard to dependent claims 29-30, 32-33, claims 29-30, 32-33 reflect the computer program product comprising computer readable instructions used for performing the methods as claimed in claims 17-18, 20-21, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to claims 34-36, claims 34-36 reflect the computer program product comprising computer readable instructions used for performing the methods as claimed in claims 22-24, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 9/20/2006 have been fully and carefully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the cited references do not teach comparing DTDs with one another. It is respectfully noted that Gajraj teaches in Figure 16 item 380 "Resolve conflicts..., to determine unique mapping of each element from DTD A to element from DTD B". If not inherent, this citing is at the very least suggestive of comparing DTDs "with each other".

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William L. Bashore whose telephone number is (571) 272-4088. The examiner can normally be reached on 11:30am - 8:00pm EST.

Art Unit: 2176

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

8. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

November 26, 2006